



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Synopses of Important Articles.

THE EASY YOKE. By PROFESSOR A. B. BRUCE, in the *Expositor*, August, 1898.

WHEN Jesus said, "My yoke is easy," he probably had in his view a contrast between his teaching and that of the scribes. Under this title, then, may be considered some of the sayings uttered by our Lord in connection with his various encounters with the religious teachers of Israel. The first gospel contains the fullest account of his antiscribal polemic, but those contained in Mark are sufficient for the purpose. There are eight in all: (1) Power on earth to forgive sins, 2:10; (2) I came not to call the righteous, but sinners, 2:17; (3) New wine into new bottles, 2:22; (4) The sabbath for man, not man for the sabbath, 2:27; (5) Always lawful to do good, 3:4; (6) Not that which goeth into the mouth, but that which cometh out, defileth, 7:15; (7) What God hath joined together let not man put asunder, 10:9; (8) To Cæsar Cæsar's, to God God's, 12:17. Matthew has all these Logia; Luke omits No. 6, and gives No. 7 in a very imperfect form (Luke 16:18).

The first two announce the advent of the era of grace; the next four contain the charter of spiritual liberty; the last two lay the foundations of social health by proclaiming the sanctity of the marriage tie, and by assigning to the state its legitimate sphere. All these sayings bear a stamp of genuineness which leaves no room for doubt that they form together a little treasure of veritable utterances of the great Master. They are, one and all, of permanent value; perennial light for Christians, not merely temporary lightning directed against an evil system prevalent in Israel eighteen hundred years ago. The apostolic church from the first perceived their importance, and felt their life-giving power; hence their sure place in the primitive tradition.

When Jesus asserted his power on earth to forgive sins, he proclaimed the difference between the old era of legalism and the new era of grace; between the God of the scribes and the true God. A great principle was involved, a whole world of new religious thought was contained in his assertion. It meant that God was not a mere Governor

and Judge. He is, more characteristically, more divinely, a God who delighteth in mercy. Let grace be the watchword now; let all men know that God multiplies pardons. And in the second saying, "I came not to call the righteous, but sinners," the kingdom appears as a beneficent, epoch-making, eventful revolution. It puts all good things within the reach of the erring, even of those who have greatly erred. All things, not merely pardon, but power to be and to do good—eminent attainment in sanctity and wisdom. For, of course, the new policy does not undervalue righteousness; it simply adopts a new method of propagating it. The kingdom is for sinners in order that they may be saints, and for producing sanctity reliance is placed on the effect of magnanimous treatment. In the new era of grace retributive justice is superseded by divine generosity. God forgives that he may be feared. Divine goodness is trusted to as the great power making for repentance. This new way may fail in many instances, but on the whole it works well. Forgiveness does foster piety. Men love God because he is gracious.

The next four (Nos. 3–6) significant utterances of Jesus free the life of the individual from the hampering power of artificial restrictions connected with ascetic practices, holy times, and ritual rules. Fasting, sabbath observance, beneficent deeds, and ceremonial purity are set in their true relation to the gospel. The tendency of the external features of religion is to dominate over the internal. The requirements of fasting, and of keeping the sabbath in a certain prescribed manner, and of the ceremonially clean and unclean, made religious life a burden, and engrossed the individual in forms and petty details. The gospel freed mankind from these bonds of conventional religion, and gave room for full, free religious experience and beneficent activity. The hour for abolishing the yoke of ceremonialism had come, and Jesus spoke the emancipating word.

The last two sayings of Jesus here cited make for the redemption of society, or for Christian civilization. In setting up his lofty ideal of the marriage tie he prepared the way for the advancement of woman, and defended society against the degrading influence of lawless appetite on the one hand, and against the less repulsive, but not less anti-social, influence of ascetic sanctity on the other. In the matter of state and religion, he pronounced that Cæsar has his place, that theocracy does not exclude secular government, that Messianic ideas and hopes do not necessarily mean political independence. It is another vindication of the human as against the falsely conceived divine.

The effect gained by viewing together these scattered sayings is good, and the superiority of Jesus' ideas over those of his contemporaries is striking and beyond question. The fault of the presentation is in the impression which the reader receives that Jesus' ideas were entirely *new*, that they had never been spoken among men before, that the then current Jewish ideas were the best that had been known up to Jesus' time. So Dr. Bruce speaks of "the new era of grace," "a whole world of new religious thought," "new policy," "new method," "new way" of accomplishing righteousness, namely, by forgiveness instead of by penalty on God's part. But Jesus' ideas in these matters were substantially those of the greatest Old Testament prophets. They viewed God, and taught him, as a God of forgiveness and mercy (Ex. 34:6 f.; 2 Sam. 24:14; Neh. 9:17-31; Ps. 85:2; 103:2-8; Isa. 55:7; 63:7; Jer. 31:34; 33:7-11; Dan. 9:9; Joel 2:13); they held and preached that ceremonial religion was secondary and practically detrimental to true religion (1 Sam. 16:7; Ps. 24:3 f.; 51:10; Isa. 1:11-18; Jer. 17:10; 31:33; Hos. 6:6 (*cf.* Matt. 9:13; 12:7); Am. 5:21-24; Mic. 6:8). The Jewish people contemporary with these prophets never rose to the prophetic ideal, in thought or practice; and Jesus' contemporaries were still worse, their zeal for the externals of religion having obscured the spiritual realities and obligations. Jesus' task was to restore the ideal which the prophets had proclaimed. This makes a very great difference. The conception which sometimes is found, and which Dr. Bruce in his language here unintentionally substantiates, is that until the first century A. D. God was a God of law and penalty, domineering, exacting, and severe; that forgiveness, love, and mercy became known only through Jesus; and that until Jesus abrogated the ceremonial law, sabbath ritual, ascetic practices, and the like, *i. e.*, throughout the Old Testament period, they were a divinely instituted system, useful to and obligatory upon men. But in fact these false conceptions of God and of religious duty were the perverse imaginings of men, condemned by the Old Testament prophets, and by the kind of religious life which they produced. It is well that the case be understood, and that those who write upon it make it plain to the reader. Religious truth and duty are one and the same, in substance, for all men and all times; the misconceptions of previous centuries as to what was religious truth and duty should not be perpetuated, even historically.

C. W. V.

A HISTORICAL COMMENTARY ON THE EPISTLE TO THE GALATIANS.

III.¹ By PROFESSOR W. M. RAMSAY, in the *Expositor*, August, 1898.

(13) Spirit of chaps. 3, 4. Postponing for later discussion the historical questions connected with the second chapter, attention should be directed to Paul's aim in the portions of the letter immediately following. He must touch the Galatians' hearts and work them up again to that frame of mind in which he had left them fresh from his first message. Arguments as to his own consistency would, therefore, be out of place.

(14) Galatians in 3:1. The opening words of chap. 3, "O, foolish Galatians," express not indignation, but pathos. While authority

¹ See the BIBLICAL WORLD, August, 1898, pp. 117-19.

is there, the deepest feeling is that of love and sorrow. It is only when moved by the deep emotion of pathos that Paul directly addresses those to whom he is writing, *e. g.*, 2 Cor. 6 : 11 ; Phil. 4 : 15. Somewhat analogous is 1 Tim. 1 : 18 (which one's literary sense must pronounce genuine). 1 Tim. 6 : 20 is different in type. Paul was enough of an orator to let this love and pity for his beloved children escape him. In this stress of emotion he must use one word to represent the whole body of believers in Antioch, Iconium, Derbe, and Lystra. The one title common to them is the one used, "Galatæ."

Three arguments are brought against this position by those who hold the North-Galatian view: (*a*) such an appellation was unnecessary in case these churches were addressed; (*b*) the term Galatia was not used for the country in which these four cities were; (*c*) only Gauls by race could be called Galatæ. The first objection is met by recalling the emotion with which Paul spoke. The other two demand attention.

(15) Galatia the province. The decisive argument that Paul's "Galatia" must be the province is stated by Zahn: Paul never uses any geographical names except Roman provincial. Luke, however, is not Roman, but Greek in terminology. Why should not Luke have followed the universal habit of Greek and Latin writers, and have used "Galatia," had he been speaking of North Galatia? Instead he speaks of the "Galatic territory." On the South-Galatian view it was almost unavoidable that he should differ from Paul, for the custom of naming the province differed as one wrote from the Roman or Greek point of view. Now, the Greeks never used "Galatia" to denominate the Roman province, but spoke of its various constituent regions, *e. g.*, Galatia (*i. e.*, North Galatia), Phrygia, Lycaonia, etc., but occasionally they speak of "the Galatic eparchy." Now, this is the habit of Luke. Further, in inscriptions and Ptolemy, "Galatia" is applied to countries like Pontus and Phrygia. It is demonstrable that "Galatia" was applied to the entire province by Roman writers. Accordingly Paul's usage of the word is correctly interpreted as including the region in which were the four cities, while at the same time Luke's usage is that of the common Greek term for the same region.

(16) Galatians and Gauls. Zahn, in retracting his original statement, which denied this Roman usage, committed himself to the sweeping negation that "Galatæ" could not be used to designate the people of Roman Galatia, being confined to those who had the blood right to it. But such a denial is contradicted (*a*) by the Roman use of such a

derivative to indicate the inhabitants of a province ; *e.g.*, Tacitus uses the form *Galatarum* in referring to recruits which were not drawn exclusively from the Gaulish tribes, as Mommsen has shown. (*b*) Even before the formation of the Roman province "Galatian" had ceased to imply Gaulish descent. This is not merely probable on general grounds, when one considers the small proportion of the invaders to the original inhabitants of the country, but from the use of "Galatians" with reference to the inhabitants of Pessinius, a city that was never thoroughly Gaulish. Again, in the second century before Christ, we find certain slaves called Galatians, and it is less likely that these were Gauls than that they were inhabitants of Galatia, not only on general grounds, but from the names of some of the slaves which are not Gaulish. Thus he who sprang from Galatia (in the Roman sense) was Galatian.

(17) St. Paul's point of view. Paul does not refer to the citizens of a Roman colony, Philippi, except under a Roman (not Greek) name (4:15). How else could he address the united people of the colonies Antioch and Lystra, or the cities that bore officially an emperor's name, Claud-iconium and Claudio-Derbe, except by the one title which indicated their common connection, "Ye of the province Galatia," *Galatæ*?

In his third paper, while dealing less with the thought of the epistle, Professor Ramsay has undertaken a necessary task in his interpretation of "Galatian." On the whole, it can be said he has made a good argument, although his reference to the Galatians of Pessinius is not altogether convincing. The very fact that the city was only partly Gaulish might give rise to the conclusion that the term Galatian, when applied to its inhabitants, was intended to discriminate between the two groups of citizens. On the other hand, his argument from Roman usage, in naming inhabitants of a province from the official name of the province, seems conclusive. In making the prevailing tone of the epistle pathetic rather than angry, Professor Ramsay is undoubtedly correct. Yet one is not so ready to believe it to be lacking in elements of indignation.

S. M.

THE HITTITE CYLINDER IN THE COLLECTION OF COUNT TYSKIEWICZ (*Cylindre Hittite, de la Collection du comte Tyskiewicz*).—This remarkable cylinder is one of a choice collection of antiquities just recently purchased for about \$21,000 for the museum at Boston. The cylinder in question is of hematite, fifty-eight centimeters long by twenty-four centimeters in diameter. It has a pointed cone, which is pierced by a transverse hole. The body of the cylinder is occupied by a com-

plicated scene inclosed between two rows of double spirals. Its Hittite origin is determined by a group of Hittite characters on the base, inclosed between two concentric circles of spirals. The principal scene is extremely interesting. A man is stretched upon a table; from his body flames seem to be rising, while at the head and foot of the body stand two persons, performing some kind of operation. Near by another person is lying, as if awaiting his turn, while just behind the operators there seem to be two worshipers. Then there is a personage seated on a throne, in front of which two lions, standing on their hind feet, support a crescent-shaped object. On the lower part of the scene are various objects, such as vases, heads of animals, etc. Other human figures also appear in other rôles. The interpretation of this cylinder must await assistance from others belonging to the same class.—SOLOMON REINACH, in *Revue archéologique*, May-June, 1898, pp. 421-3.

THE FORE-COURT OF WOMEN.—The generally accepted opinion is that it was within the wall which surrounded the temple and its side buildings, and that it was separated from the adjoining fore-court of laymen by a partition. This view is based almost exclusively on Josephus, with a practical disregard of the evidence of the Mishna. But this fore-court of women was on the *outside* of the encompassing wall, and not *within*, as commonly maintained. From Josephus, *Contra Apionem*, II, 8, §103, and other scattered passages, we learn that all the parts enumerated in the passage, *Contra Apionem*, were bounded within and without by walls and other inclosures. The first fore-court open to the heathen was surrounded on the outside, in an inclosed square, by the high wall of the temple mount with its porches, and within by a partition of stone. The third fore-court, that of the laymen, was bounded from without by the strong wall which surrounded the temple in the shape of a quadrangle, and from within by a low partition of stone. Between these two fore-courts intervened the second, viz., that of women, bounded on the outside by the partition of the heathen, and on the inside by the surrounding wall of the temple. This fore-court, too, encompassed the whole building, and not simply one side of the temple mount. The inner arrangement of the fore-court of women is not exactly clear, either in Josephus or in the Mishna, or in both combined, though some details may be determined with practical certainty. Neither do our sources clearly state the purpose of this fore-court, except in a few details. After an

examination of the meager details handed down, we must conclude that in the temple of Herod there was no separate fore-court for women to worship in ; and that the one described by Josephus (in *Bellum*, V, 5, 2) must have come into existence in the time after Herod. This position is confirmed by the history of the temple gates described by Josephus (*Bellum*, V, 5, 3) in connection with the fore-court of women.

— PROFESSOR ADOLF BÜCHLER, in *Jewish Quarterly Review*, July, 1898, pp. 678–718.